DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 212 336 JC 820 045

AUTHOR Behrendt, Richard L.
TITLE Follow-Up Study Comparisons: 1974 & 1976 Entrants and 1980 Graduates. Hagerstown Junior College and Maryland Community Colleges.
INSTITUTION Hagerstown Junior Coll., Md.; Maryland Community Colleges Research Group.; Maryland State Board for Community Colleges, Annapolis.
PUB DATE Oct 81
NOTE 75p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Associate Degrees; *College Graduates; *College Transfer Students; Community Colleges; Comparative Analysis; Dropout Research; Education Work Relationship; Employment; Graduate Surveys; Participant Satisfaction; Questionnaires; State Surveys; Student Educational Objectives; Tables (Data); Two Year Colleges; *Two Year College Students; *Vocational Education; Vocational Followup
IDENTIFIERS *Maryland

ABSTRACT

Text and accompanying data tables in this report compare Hagerstown Junior College (HJC) with the Maryland community colleges as a whole with regard to the findings of three statewide follow-up studies: a survey (conducted in Spring, 1978) of first-time students who entered the colleges in Fall, 1974; a survey (conducted in Spring, 1980) of first-time students who entered the colleges in Fall, 1976; and a survey (conducted in Spring, 1981) of students who graduated from the colleges in 1980. The report first summarizes the goals, assumptions, limitations, methodology, procedures, and return rates for the three studies, which were designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the Maryland community colleges in helping students achieve educational goals, find employment, or transfer to a university. The next three sections of the report compare HJC and statewide findings for the two first-time student surveys, for the 1980 graduate survey, and for the three surveys combined. With variations, comparisons are made in findings related to respondent characteristics, educational goals, goal and degree achievement, reasons for leaving college, employment status, transfer rates among collegiate students, relationship of transfer major or job to the community college program, academic success of transfer students, and satisfaction with the community colleges. Summary conclusions are then outlined, and the questionnaires are appended. (JP)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED212336

Follow-Up Study Comparisons: 1974 & 1976 Entrants and 1980 Graduates

Hagerstown Junior College

and

Maryland Community Colleges

Richard L. Behrendt, Ph.D.
Dean of Supportive Services
Hagerstown Junior College
Hagerstown, Maryland 21740

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Richard L. Behrendt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

October, 1981

JC 820045

FOLLOW-UP STUDY COMPARISONS;
1974 & 1976 ENTRANTS AND 1980 GRADUATES

Hagerstown Junior College
and
Maryland Community Colleges

ABSTRACT

All of the Maryland community colleges have conducted follow-up studies of their students to help evaluate college instructional programs. These studies are also used to evaluate the extent to which the colleges assist students in achieving their educational goals, their career development, their opportunities for employment, and their preparation for transfer. Past studies have included surveys of entrants (students who entered a community college but did not necessarily graduate), graduates and their employers, and the transfer success of students at four-year public colleges.

This current report compares Hagerstown Junior College and all Maryland community colleges results from three follow-up studies -- Fall 1974 first time entrants, Fall 1976 first time entrants, and 1980 graduates. These surveys were completed in Spring 1978, Spring 1980, and Spring 1981. The statewide response rates were 43%-47% (entrants) and 65% (graduates); the HJC response rates were 68%-70% (entrants) and 79% (graduates).

The major findings included in this report are:

*Credit students at HJC are more likely to be enrolled full-time, complete an AA degree, and be somewhat younger than the statewide average. In addition, these HJC students are less likely to be female or of a racial minority than the statewide students.

*Both the HJC and statewide trend is toward a higher part-time enrollment, with more students enrolled in career programs and more likely to be female.

*62%-69% of the entrants and 86% of the graduates (HJC and statewide) report they have achieved their educational goal.

*Regardless of the individual student's goal, a higher percentage of HJC entrants report they achieved their educational goal when compared with statewide results.

*Approximately two-thirds of the HJC entrants remain employed in Washington County after attending HJC.

*Upon transfer to a four-year institution, both HJC and statewide entrants and graduates lose very few credits, achieve satisfactory grade point averages, and indicate they are satisfied with their preparation for transfer.

*Most community college students (approximately 90%) chose their community college because of its convenient location, a specific program, or its low cost.

*80%-85% of the HJC and statewide graduates are employed in positions that are either directly or somewhat related to their community college programs.

*93% of the HJC and statewide graduates are either extremely satisfied or satisfied with the preparation for employment they received at their community college.

*A much higher percentage of graduates reported that they had achieved their goal when compared with entrants.

*While persistence to graduation has no impact upon the number of credits which might be lost at transfer, graduates do seem to have a somewhat higher overall grade point average after transfer.

*In general, graduates seem to be slightly more pleased with the quality of instruction and the overall quality of their community college when compared with entrants.

*95% or more of the HJC and statewide entrants and graduates indicate they are satisfied with the quality of instruction and overall quality of their community college.

PREFACE

This report presents comparisons of the results and implications of three student follow-up studies:

1. Fall 1974 first time entrants;

2. Fall 1976 first time entrants; and

3. 1980 graduates.

Comparisons are made between Hagerstown Junior College results and total Maryland community colleges findings for both entrants and graduates. In addition, the current report includes comparisons between entrants and graduates.

The studies were joint projects of the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges and the Maryland Community College Research Group. The work was completed with the cooperation and assistance of the follow-up study coordinators at each of the community colleges and the results were compiled by the State Board for Community Colleges.

Acknowledgment is due the Maryland Community College Research Group and the State Board for the research design and data collection. Also, it should be noted that information from reports of previous follow-up studies has been used to complete this current report.

RICHARD L. BEHRENDT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

PREFACE. v

TABLE OF CONTENTS. vii

LIST OF TABLES ix

LIST OF APPENDICES xi

THE PROBLEM AND ITS SETTING. 1

INTRODUCTION 3
PURPOSES 3
PROBLEM. 4
DEFINITIONS OF TERMS 5
ASSUMPTIONS. 6
LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY 6
METHOD 7

RESULTS. 11

1974 AND 1976 ENTRANTS 13
1980 GRADUATES 31
ENTRANTS AND GRADUATES COMPARISON. 51

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS. 59

REFERENCES 63

APPENDICES 65

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Characteristics of the Respondents	15
2.	Educational Goals of Students	17
3.	Self-Reported Goal Achievement	18
4.	Degree Achievement among Students Whose Goal Was a Community College Degree	19
5.	Primary Reason for Not Returning to College	20
6.	Employment Status	21
7.	Full-Time Employment among Students Whose Goal Was Career Development	22
8.	Employment Location of Entrants	23
9.	Employment Assistance Provided by Career Programs	24
10.	Transfer among Students Whose Goal Was Transfer	24
11.	Respondents Who Transferred	25
12.	Transfer Institution of the Students	26
13.	Relationship of Respondents' Community College Programs to Their Transfer Major	27
14.	Success of Respondents in Transfer Institutions	28
15.	Community College Evaluation	30
16.	Characteristics of the Respondents	33
17.	Primary Reasons for Choice of This Community College	35
18.	Educational Goals of 1980 Graduates	36
19.	Self-Reported Goal Achievement	37
20.	Employment Status	37
21.	Full-Time Employment among Students Whose Goal Was Career Development	38
22.	Relationship of the Respondents' Programs to Their Full-Time Employment	38

TABLE PAGE

23. Assistance in Location of Employment 39
24. Employment Location of 1980 Graduates. 40
25. Satisfaction with Preparation for Employment 41
26. Mean Annual Salaries of Career Program Graduates 42
27. Transfer among Graduates Whose Goal Was Transfer 43
28. Respondents Who Transferred. 44
29. Transfer Institution of the 1980 Graduates 45
30. Relationship of 1980 Graduates' Community College Programs to Their Transfer Major and Employment 46
31. Success of Respondents in Transfer Institutions. 47
32. Community College Evaluation 49
33. Educational Goals of Entrants and Graduates. 53
34. Self-Reported Goal Achievement 54
35. Full-Time Employment among Students Whose Goal Was Career Development 55
36. Transfer among Students Whose Goal Was Transfer. 55
37. Success of Respondents in Transfer Institutions. 56
38. Community College Evaluation 58

LIST OF APPENDICES

		PAGE
A.	Maryland Community College Research Group.	65
B.	1974 Entrants Follow-Up Questionnaire.	67
C.	1976 Entrants Follow-Up Questionnaire.	69
D.	1980 Graduates Follow-Up Questionnaire	71
E.	Student Goal Achievement in Maryland Community Colleges. . .	75

THE PROBLEM
AND
ITS SETTING

FOLLOW-UP STUDY COMPARISONS:
1974 & 1976 ENTRANTS AND 1980 GRADUATES

Hagerstown Junior College
and
Maryland Community Colleges

INTRODUCTION

In 1978 and again in 1980, surveys were conducted of 1974 and 1976 first time entrants to Maryland community colleges. These surveys were conducted at each of the Maryland community colleges and constitute the fourth and fifth studies of entrants to these institutions.

In Spring 1981, a survey was conducted of 1980 graduates of Maryland community colleges and this effort was the second such study of graduates.

PURPOSES

The primary purpose of these studies was to help each of the community colleges and the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges evaluate the extent to which they:

1. Assisted students in achieving their goals;
2. Assisted students in their career development; and
3. Assisted students in their preparation for transfer to a senior college or university.

In addition, the surveys have provided data for the Program Data Monitoring Systems, the Vocational Educational Data System (VEDS), and analyses and studies within each college. Finally, they provide statistics for reports such as this one which allows an individual school to compare outcomes among entrants and graduates as well as to compare its results with statewide figures.

Studies such as these help the Maryland community colleges to understand the goals and aspirations of their students and to evaluate the extent to which the community colleges have assisted students in achieving their goals.

PROBLEM

The central problem addressed in these studies was that each of the Maryland community colleges and the State Board for Community Colleges needed updated information about the basic outcomes of community college education. While statewide student follow-up studies have been conducted on a regular basis in Maryland since 1971, it is still important to have current information about why students came to the community colleges, how they evaluated their programs and institutions, and what they did with their community college education.

In Maryland, program evaluation is initiated by the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges and begins with the Program Data Monitoring (PDM) System, which is a computerized display of enrollment, degree, follow-up, discipline costs, and manpower information. Each program at each college receives one page of computer-printed information and the student follow-up studies are important elements of the PDM System since the employment rate, employment in field of training, transfer rate, and student satisfaction are shown in the display. Also, information is shown for both entrants and graduates for each program. Using the PDM System, the State Board for Community Colleges selects certain programs for qualitative investigation by the colleges.

The Vocational Education Data System (VEDS) is a comprehensive data collection system federally mandated by the Education Amendments of 1976.

Since basic information about employment rate and employment in trained fields is required, a statewide approach simplifies the process of providing valid and reliable data.

In addition to these specific uses of the data, the discussions and reports generated by the statewide and individual campus studies of the survey are important during a time when the community colleges are admitting more nontraditional students with different goals. The individual ways students are using community colleges to accomplish their personal goals are changing and the colleges must adapt to meet these flexible student needs.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMS

Entrant: a student who was attending the community college for the first time and who had no previous college experience.

Program: a series of courses leading to a certificate or associate degree and the basis for reporting data at the State level.

Certificate: an award granted for the successful completion of 12 to 45 credits of instruction in an occupational program.

Associate in Arts: a degree awarded for the successful completion of a prescribed curriculum of at least 60 credits; the same award is given for both transfer and occupational programs.

Academic goal: the aim of the student in terms of credentialing; in this study, academic goals can be courses of interest, certificate, or associate in arts degree.

Personal goal: the aim of the student in terms of functional reasons for attendance, such as to prepare for employment or transfer.

Career development: the preparation for new employment or continued growth in one's current occupation.

ASSUMPTIONS

During the course of these surveys, it was assumed that:

1. The goals of each of the seventeen Maryland community colleges included helping students to achieve educational, career, and transfer goals;
2. Each Maryland community college wants to know about the outcomes of the educational process and will use such knowledge to improve the college; and
3. Assessing the outcomes of education is a complex task and the current study must be combined with other evidence to draw an accurate picture.

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The outcomes explored were basic ones and generally limited to goal achievement, employment, and transfer. However, while these outcomes are important, they represent only a fraction of the possible effects of college attendance. Changes in aspiration, competence, and personality were not investigated.

Also, the studies were not able to statistically assess the factors which helped and hindered student success and this is a crucial element if the results are to be used by colleges to improve education. However, some insight into these factors has been provided in the Conclusions and Recommendations Section of this report.

A further limitation is presented by the factor that goal questions were asked three and one-half years after admission to the college. Some students may not have remembered their original goals and some may have unconsciously altered them.

In addition, the study made no attempt to compare community college outcomes with the outcomes of other institutions, such as proprietary schools, military training programs, or four-year colleges and universities.

Next, the comparisons which were made between Hagerstown Junior College and the statewide results are provided only to offer a general indication of the relative position of HJC with respect to the total state picture. It would be unwise to draw definitive conclusions from such a comparison.

Finally, it is important to consider the possibility of response bias in these surveys. In an earlier study of 1972 entrants, telephone follow-ups of non-respondents found that these non-respondents were significantly less interested in transfer goals, less likely to have transferred, more likely to be employed and more likely to recommend the program of study. Therefore, respondents in the 1974 and 1976 entrants study are also likely to differ from non-respondents on these critical variables and it is not wise to generalize to the entire population of entered students for these variables.

METHOD

Study Populations - 1974 and 1976 Entrants

The study populations were defined as all persons who were first-time degree credit students in a Maryland community college during Fall 1974 or Fall 1976. This population consisted of 23,199 students in 1974 and 26,829 students in Fall 1976 who had been in occupational, transfer, and undeclared programs. Of these total populations, Hagerstown Junior College was represented by 716 students in Fall 1974 and 929 students in Fall 1976. In 1974, the 16 Maryland community colleges then

in existence participated, but in 1976 all 17 of the current Maryland public community colleges took part.

Study Population - 1980 Graduates

The population was defined as all students who graduated from a community college during fiscal year 1980. A total of 7,050 persons who graduated with a certificate or associate in arts degree were included, as were students from either an occupational or transfer program. All 17 Maryland community colleges participated in the graduate follow-up. A few students are represented in both the entrant and graduate populations if they graduated within four years of their entrance.

Data Collection

The questionnaires considered for both entrants and graduates were developed by the Maryland Community College Research Group and included questions on goals and goal achievement, employment, transfer, and student satisfaction. (See Appendix A, B, C, and D.)

In addition to the responses to the questionnaires, the following information was supplied directly from college records:

Program at exit from the community college;

Credit hours earned;

Highest degree earned;

Overall grade point average;

Current enrollment status;

Sex;

Year of birth; and

Race.

Procedure

The State Board for Community Colleges distributed the questionnaires to the colleges for mailing to both entrants and graduates and each college used student records to develop a master list of its study population. This master list was used to keep track of the packets returned as undeliverable by the U.S. Postal Service.

For entrants, the first packets were mailed in March 1978 (for 1974 entrants) and in March 1980 (for 1976 entrants) and consisted of a cover letter from the college, the questionnaire, and a pre-addressed return envelope. At two-three week intervals, second and third mailings were made to nonrespondents. Thus, entrants were surveyed about three and one-half years after entry.

Graduate questionnaires were mailed in January 1980, about eight months after most students graduated. The mailing and record-keeping procedures were similar to those used for entrants.

Each college coordinator forwarded the completed questionnaires, including the demographic information supplied from the college file, to the State Board for Community Colleges. The data were keypunched and verified at the University of Maryland Computer Science Center. The Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) (Nie, Hull, Jenkins, Steinbrenner, and Bent, 1976) was used for the statistical analyses. Each community college was provided the results for their college, statewide aggregate results, and the original questionnaires. Student identifiers were not punched and no personally identifiable student records are maintained by the SBCC.

Return Rate

In all three studies, a number of questionnaires were returned as undeliverable by the U.S. Postal Service, producing an unadjusted response rate as well as a final response rate among those who actually received questionnaires. A summary of the return rate is shown below.

	1974 ENTRANTS		1976 ENTRANTS		1980 GRADUATES	
Information	HJC	State	HJC	State	HJC	State
Number of colleges participating	1	16	1	17	1	17
Population	716	23,199	929	26,829	258	7,050
Undeliverable questionnaires	156	5,001	233	7,388	21	474
Usable responses	383	7,904	490	9,150	186	4,280
Unadjusted response rate	54%	34%	53%	34%	72%	61%
Response rate among those receiving questionnaires	68%	43%	70%	47%	79%	65%

RESULTS

1974 AND 1976 ENTRANTS

RESULTS

On the following pages are presented comparisons between the 1974 and 1976 entrants at HJC and for all the Maryland community colleges. It is important to note that the statewide results include Hagerstown Junior College -- the HJC results have not been removed from the statewide totals. Thus, the HJC results are being compared with the results of the total population. It was decided to make the comparison in this manner since the HJC respondents only represent 3%-3.5% of the total population and the additional statistical manipulation necessary to remove the HJC results would not have produced significant changes in the population results.

TABLE 1

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
PROGRAM TYPE				
TRANSFER	39	46	38	42
CAREER	32	37	36	40
UNDECLARED	29	17	26	18
HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED				
AA	34	22	27	19
CERTIFICATE	1	1	.2	1
NONE	66	77	73	80
SEX				
MALE	48	41	45	40
FEMALE	52	59	55	60
RACE				
MINORITY	1	15	3	13
WHITE	99	85	97	87
ATTENDANCE STATUS				
PART-TIME	44	55	46	55
FULL-TIME	56	45	54	45
MEAN CREDITS EARNED	36.2	31.3	33.7	29.9
CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE	2.65	2.7	2.7	2.6
MEAN AGE	23.9	26.2	23.6	25.7

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

With respect to program type, the changes which occurred from 1974 to 1976 have not been significant. However, the comparison between the HJC and statewide results reveal that HJC shows a much higher percentage of undeclared students during these years. The program identification process at HJC has been modified since this time and subsequent follow-up studies should reveal a drop in the percentage of those students with an undeclared major.

A much higher percentage of HJC entrants (than statewide) have completed an AA degree three and one-half years after their initial enrollment. But as more part-time students enroll, this percentage has declined from 1974 to 1976. This is true both at HJC and statewide.

Both the HJC and statewide results indicate a higher percentage of female enrollment -- although HJC still does not have as high a percentage of female enrollment as do the other community colleges.

Not surprisingly, the minority enrollment at HJC is significantly lower than at the other community colleges. This is true because 85%-90% of HJC's enrollment comes from Washington County, which has a 3%-5% minority population.

The part-time enrollment at HJC grew slightly from 1974 to 1976, but still has not reached the 55% part-time statewide enrollment percentage.

Since HJC has a higher percentage of respondents who were enrolled on a full-time basis, it is not surprising that, on the average, they have earned more credits than the statewide respondents. Also, the mean credits earned at HJC dropped 2.5 credits during this time span as part-time enrollment increased.

No significant differences are evident from the cumulative grade point averages, either over the two-year time span or between HJC and the statewide community colleges..

Again, since HJC enrolls more full-timers than the statewide results, it is not surprising that the mean age of the HJC students is lower than for the statewide community colleges.

TABLE 2

EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF STUDENTS

	1974		1976	
PRIMARY GOAL	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
PREPARE FOR TRANSFER TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE	36	32	33	32
PREPARE FOR IMMEDIATE ENTRY INTO A CAREER	22	18	23	20
INTEREST AND SELF-ENRICHMENT	16	19	18	18
EXPLORE NEW CAREER OR NEW ACADEMIC AREAS	11	14	12	15
UPDATE SKILLS FOR A JOB CURRENTLY HELD	12	13	12	12
OTHER GOALS	3	3	2	3
	100	100	100	100

EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF STUDENTS

The most noteworthy differences in goals is evident among the higher percentage of HJC students who were enrolled to prepared themselves for transfer to a four-year college or for immediate entry into a career. In 1974, 68% of the HJC students had one of these goals while only 50% of the statewide students had similar goals. In 1976, however, this gap had narrowed as the HJC percentage dropped to 66% while the statewide figure rose to 52%.

Generally speaking, the goals of community college students are obviously quite varied.

TABLE 3

SELF-REPORTED GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	69	63	69	62

SELF-REPORTED GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

A significantly higher percentage of the HJC respondents reported three and one-half years after their entrance that they had achieved their educational goal. However, both percentages remain high and it is evident that, among all first time entrants to community colleges, 60%-70% report having achieved their educational goals.

TABLE 4

DEGREE ACHIEVEMENT AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS A COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEGREE

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	63	43	57	35

DEGREE ACHIEVEMENT AMONG STUDENTS
WHOSE GOAL WAS A COMMUNITY COLLEGE DEGREE

The difference between the HJC and statewide results are even more evident here as HJC degree achievements are around 60% while the statewide results are nearer 40%. In both cases, however, the percentages have gone down noticeably from 1974 to 1976.

TABLE 5

PRIMARY REASON FOR NOT RETURNING TO COLLEGE

	1974		1976	
REASON	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
ACHIEVED EDUCATIONAL GOAL	16	16	19	19
TRANSFERRED	14	15	16	16
SCHEDULING CONFLICT BETWEEN JOB AND STUDIES	15	14	16	15
PERSONAL/MARRIAGE	18	13	10	10
ACCEPTED A JOB	9	9	11	10
PROGRAM OR COURSES NOT AVAILABLE	7	8	8	8
UNSURE ABOUT CHOICE OF MAJOR	3	5	5	5
CHANGED EDUCATIONAL GOAL	6	4	4	4
DISSATISFACTION WITH PROGRAM	5	3	2	3
DISSATISFIED WITH QUALITY OF TEACHING	1	2	1	3
FINANCIAL AID WAS NOT SUFFICIENT	2	2	0	2
LOW GRADES	3	1	1	1
COURSE WORK NOT CHALLENGING	0	1	0	1
FOUND COURSES TOO DIFFICULT	0	1	0	1
APPLIED, BUT COULD NOT OBTAIN FINANCIAL AID	0	1	0	1
THIS COLLEGE WAS TOO EXPENSIVE	1	1	0	1
CHILD CARE TOO COSTLY	1	1	2	1
WENT INTO MILITARY SERVICE	0	1	3	1

NOTE: ONLY NONGRADUATES ARE INCLUDED.

PRIMARY REASON FOR NOT RETURNING TO COLLEGE

Among those students who did not graduate, a wide variety of reasons is listed for not returning to the community college. These reasons are displayed on Table 5.

It should be noted that the percentage who did not return because they achieved their educational goal went up from 16% to 19% over the two-year span. Beyond this "positive" reason, a large number did not return for reasons that could be assumed to be beyond the control of the college (transferred, scheduling conflict, personal, and accepting a job). The percentage of students who dropped out for "negative" reasons (dissatisfied, insufficient financial aid, etc.) was very low.

TABLE 6
EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	81	75	82	83
FULL-TIME	65	57	64	61
PART-TIME	16	18	19	22

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

The most significant differences evident in this Table are the jump from 75% (1974) statewide employment to 83% (1976) statewide employment and the fact that more HJC respondents were employed on a full-time basis than for the statewide respondents.

TABLE 7

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS CAREER DEVELOPMENT

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	81	79	79	74

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS CAREER DEVELOPMENT

In both 1974 and 1976, a higher percentage of HJC students achieved their goal compared with the statewide respondents. It is also significant to note that a greater percentage of those respondents with career goals achieve their goals when compared with those who had transfer goals (see Table 4).

TABLE 8

EMPLOYMENT LOCATION OF ENTRANTS

	1974		1976	
LOCATION	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
SAME COUNTY/CITY AS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	69	50	65	54
OTHER MARYLAND COUNTY	9	14	14	17
BALTIMORE CITY	2	22	0	12
WASHINGTON, D.C.	2	6	3	9
DELAWARE	0	0	0	1
PENNSYLVANIA	10	2	9	1
VIRGINIA	1	2	2	2
WEST VIRGINIA	3	1	1	1
OTHER STATE	4	3	6	4

EMPLOYMENT LOCATION OF 1976 ENTRANTS

A significantly higher percentage of HJC students remain in their home area as compared with the statewide results. Also, it is not surprising that, because of their geographical locations, more of the statewide respondents are working in Baltimore City or Washington, D.C. Finally, far more of the HJC respondents are currently employed in nearby Pennsylvania.

TABLE 9

EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY CAREER PROGRAMS

	1974		1976	
TYPE OF ASSISTANCE	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
INCREASED THEORETICAL UNDERSTANDING	88	89	77	87
INCREASED JOB SKILLS	82	87	72	83
HELPED TO OBTAIN JOB	59	49	42	48
HELPED TO OBTAIN SALARY INCREASE AND/OR PROMOTION	45	45	33	42

EMPLOYMENT ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY CAREER PROGRAMS

The respondents indicated they have received assistance from career programs of various types. There was a significant decrease in the assistance received by HJC students from 1974 to 1976.

TABLE 10

TRANSFER AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS TRANSFER

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	76	76	76	70

TRANSFER AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS TRANSFER

Approximately three quarters of the HJC and statewide respondents indicated they achieved their transfer goal. Again, this goal achievement is also lower than among those students whose goal was career development (see Table 7).

TABLE 11
RESPONDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	37	35	32	33
STATUS OF STUDENTS AT TRANSFER INSTITUTION				
FULL-TIME	80	75	81	76
PART-TIME	20	25	19	24

RESPONDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED

Table 11 displays the percentage of students who transferred among all respondents, regardless of their goal. The slight decline from 1974 to 1976 is reflective of the trend toward higher career programs enrollment. The higher percentage of HJC students enrolled on a full-time basis at the transfer institution is reflective of the fact that more HJC students (than statewide) were enrolled full-time while still at HJC (see Table 1).

TABLE 12

TRANSFER INSTITUTION OF THE STUDENTS

	1974		1976	
INSTITUTION	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
MARYLAND				
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	14	30	12	29
PUBLIC STATE COLLEGE	21	25	20	23
PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR	7	7	12	7
OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4	9	5	9
TECHNICAL/COMMERCIAL	2	2	1	3
PRIVATE TWO-YEAR	1	-	0	1
TOTAL MARYLAND	49	73	50	72
NON-MARYLAND				
PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR	34	12	30	12
PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR	7	10	12	10
OTHERS	11	4	9	6
TOTAL NON-MARYLAND	52	26	51	28

TRANSFER INSTITUTION OF THE STUDENTS

Fewer HJC students enroll at the University of Maryland or at a public state college when compared with the statewide respondents. On the other hand, more HJC respondents enroll out of state at nearby public four-year colleges, such as Shepherd College and Shippensburg State College.

TABLE 13
RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENTS' COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS TO THEIR TRANSFER MAJOR

	1974		1976	
RELATIONSHIP	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
DIRECTLY RELATED	49	49	48	49
SOMEWHAT RELATED	37	34	32	34
NOT RELATED	14	16	20	17

RELATIONSHIP OF RESPONDENTS' COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS TO THEIR TRANSFER MAJOR

Results of Table 13 are similar from 1974 to 1976 and when comparing HJC with the statewide results. It is significant to note, however, that 14% to 20% of the respondents indicated their transfer major is completely unrelated to their community college program.

TABLE 14

SUCCESS OF RESPONDENTS IN TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS

	1974		1976	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
CREDITS LOST				
NONE	40	53	44	50
1 - 3	31	19	22	18
4 - 6	16	12	11	14
7 - 12	9	9	14	10
13 - 20	3	4	3	5
21 OR MORE	2	3	6	4
GRADE POINT AVERAGE				
BELOW 2.0	1	3	2	3
2.0 - 2.4	15	11	11	13
2.5 - 2.9	33	28	25	28
3.0 - 3.4	30	35	39	34
ABOVE 3.5	21	23	24	22
SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION				
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	38	33	27	31
SATISFIED	50	55	59	58
UNSATISFIED	12	12	14	11

SUCCESS OF RESPONDENTS IN TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS

A higher percentage of the statewide respondents indicated they lost no credits upon transfer to a four-year institution. However, when comparing the 1974 and 1976 HJC and statewide results among those students who lost six or fewer credits, the results are nearly identical.

Similarly, there are few significant differences when comparing grade point averages. Obviously, community college students perform well after their transfer to four-year institutions.

Finally, the degree of satisfaction with the transfer preparation at HJC showed a drop in the percentage of "Extremely Satisfied" response from 1974 to 1976. Nevertheless, the HJC and statewide results show 85%-90% of the respondents basically satisfied with their preparation for transfer.

TABLE 15

COMMUNITY COLLEGE EVALUATION

	1976	
VARIABLE	HJC	STATE
QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION		
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	28	32
SATISFIED	67	62
UNSATISFIED	5	6
OVERALL QUALITY OF COLLEGE		
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	34	33
SATISFIED	64	63
UNSATISFIED	2	4

COMMUNITY COLLEGE EVALUATION

Table 15 displays the students' responses to how satisfied they were with the quality of instruction in their program as well as with the overall quality of the college. However, since this question was not included in the 1974 follow-up study, the results displayed are only for 1976.

There are virtually no differences between the HJC and statewide results and a very low percentage of students indicated they were either unsatisfied with the instruction or with the overall quality of the college.

1980 GRADUATES

RESULTS

On the following pages are presented comparisons between the 1980 HJC graduates and 1980 graduates from all the Maryland community colleges. As with the study of entrants, the statewide results include Hagerstown Junior College totals as well. Thus, the HJC results are being compared with the results of the total Maryland community college graduate population.

TABLE 16

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

	1980 GRADUATES	
	HJC	STATE
PROGRAM TYPE		
TRANSFER	50	42
CAREER	50	58
HIGHEST DEGREE EARNED		
AA	94.1	89.2
CERTIFICATE	5.9	10.8
SEX		
MALE	47.8	40.7
FEMALE	52.2	59.3
RACE		
MINORITY	6	16
WHITE	94	84
CUMULATIVE GRADE POINT AVERAGE	3.08	3.05
MEAN AGE (IN 1980)	24.6	27.9

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

With respect to program type, HJC shows one-half of its graduates in transfer and one-half in career while the total population displays 58% career and 42% transfer program graduates.

Since the statewide figures show a higher population of career program graduates, it is not surprising that they similarly show a higher percentage of certificates awarded when compared with HJC results.

While HJC shows more female than male graduates in 1980, the difference is not so marked as for the statewide totals which reflect a 59% - 41% female-male comparison.

Because of the traditionally low minority enrollment at HJC, it is not surprising to note that only 6% of the HJC graduates were minority students whereas the statewide figures show 16% minority enrollment.

There is no difference between the HJC and statewide cumulative grade point averages and both are slightly above a "B" average.

Since HJC enrolls a higher percentage of full-time students than the other schools (see Table 1), it is not surprising that the age of the graduates from HJC is significantly lower than the statewide average age.

TABLE 17

PRIMARY REASONS

FOR CHOICE OF THIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

	1980 GRADUATES	
PRIMARY REASON	HJC	STATE
CONVENIENT LOCATION	47	40
PROGRAM I WANTED WAS OFFERED	23	30
LOW COST	18	17
COLLEGE'S ACADEMIC REPUTATION	5	5
UNWILLING OR UNABLE TO ATTEND ANOTHER COLLEGE	5	4
ADVICE OF FRIENDS	1	2
FINANCIAL AID AVAILABLE	2	2
ADVICE OF HIGH SCHOOL COUNSELOR	1	1

PRIMARY REASONS FOR CHOICE OF THIS COMMUNITY COLLEGE

A significantly higher percentage of HJC graduates enrolled at HJC because of its convenient location whereas a lower percentage enrolled here because of a specific program which they wanted. Also, the first three reasons (convenient location, a specific program, and low cost) account for nearly 90% of the primary reasons students select a community college. This rationale has been consistent and has been reflected in ACT pre-enrollment comparisons for many years.

TABLE 18

EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF 1980 GRADUATES

	1980 GRADUATES	
PRIMARY GOAL	HJC	STATE
PREPARE FOR TRANSFER TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE	40.0	36.2
PREPARE FOR IMMEDIATE ENTRY INTO A CAREER	30.3	28.8
INTEREST AND SELF-ENRICHMENT	7.4	9.4
EXPLORE NEW CAREER OR NEW ACADEMIC AREAS	14.9	16.3
UPDATE SKILLS FOR A JOB CURRENTLY HELD	6.3	6.8
OTHER GOALS	1.1	2.5
	100	100

EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF 1980 GRADUATES

A somewhat higher percentage of HJC graduates had transfer as their primary goal than at the statewide community colleges. Other than that, there are no significant differences between the HJC and statewide results.

It is interesting to note the rather high percentage of individuals who enrolled for either interest and self-enrichment or to update their skills for a job currently held and presumably had not planned on completing a degree.

TABLE 19
SELF-REPORTED GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

	1980 GRADUATES	
	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	86.4	86.4

SELF-REPORTED GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

Obviously, there is no difference in goal achievement here but it is nonetheless signficant to note what a high percentage of graduates achieved their goals.

TABLE 20
EMPLOYMENT STATUS

	1980 GRADUATES	
	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	69.9	76.2
FULL-TIME	48.9	53.3
PART-TIME	21.0	22.9

EMPLOYMENT STATUS

A somewhat lower percentage of HJC graduates are currently employed when compared with the statewide results.

TABLE 21

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS CAREER DEVELOPMENT

	1980 GRADUATES	
	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	73.4	73.7

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Among those students who had the goal of career development, nearly three out of four were employed full-time at the time this survey was conducted (approximately eight months after graduation).

TABLE 22

RELATIONSHIP OF THE RESPONDENTS' PROGRAMS TO THEIR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT

	1980 GRADUATES	
RELATIONSHIP	HJC	STATE
DIRECTLY RELATED	57	50
SOMEWHAT RELATED	28	30
NOT RELATED	15	20

RELATIONSHIP OF THE RESPONDENTS' PROGRAMS TO THEIR FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT

A higher percentage (57%) of HJC graduates are employed full-time in jobs directly related to their HJC program. Overall, 80% of the statewide graduates and 85% of the HJC graduates are employed in positions that are either directly or somewhat related to their community college programs.

TABLE 23
ASSISTANCE IN LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT

	1980 GRADUATES	
SOURCE OF ASSISTANCE	HJC	STATE
CONTACTED EMPLOYER ON OWN	46	46
FAMILY OR FRIEND	28	24
NEWSPAPER	6	13
OTHER	11	14
FACULTY	13	6
EMPLOYMENT AGENCY	7	5
COLLEGE PLACEMENT OFFICE	3	2

ASSISTANCE IN LOCATION OF EMPLOYMENT

The only noteworthy difference between the HJC and statewide results here are in the use of the newspaper and faculty as a source of assistance. At HJC, the newspaper was not nearly so valuable as for the statewide community colleges, yet the HJC faculty were far more valuable in obtaining employment than for the other community colleges.

In both cases, it is significant to note that nearly 50% of the graduates contacted the employer on their own and less than 10% using an employment agency or the college placement office.

TABLE 24

EMPLOYMENT LOCATION OF 1980 GRADUATES

	1980 GRADUATES	
LOCATION	HJC	STATE
SAME COUNTY/CITY AS COMMUNITY COLLEGE	55	47
OTHER MARYLAND COUNTY	9	16
BALTIMORE CITY	2	18
WASHINGTON, D.C.	1	10
DELAWARE	0	1
PENNSYLVANIA	19	2
VIRGINIA	2	3
WEST VIRGINIA	7	1
OTHER STATE	6	3

EMPLOYMENT LOCATION OF 1980 GRADUATES

A much higher percentage of HJC graduates have remained in their home county as compared with the statewide results. In addition, 19% are employed in Pennsylvania, presumably relatively close to Washington County.

TABLE 25

SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

	1980 GRADUATES	
SATISFACTION	HJC	STATE
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	35	29
SATISFIED	58	65
UNSATISFIED	7	7

SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION FOR EMPLOYMENT

Overall, 93% of the HJC and statewide graduates are either extremely satisfied or satisfied with the preparation they received for employment at their community college. Only 7% say they were not satisfied with their preparation.

TABLE 26

MEAN ANNUAL SALARIES OF CAREER PROGRAM GRADUATES

	1980 GRADUATES	
	HJC	STATE
ACCOUNTING & BUSINESS	13,780	14,734
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION	18,453	13,845
MERCHANDISING	10,400	15,007
SECRETARIAL SCIENCES	7,979	10,249
DATA PROCESSING	11,882	16,645
RADIOLOGY	10,560	12,537
NURSING	13,131	14,227
ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY	16,505	14,464
EARLY CHILDHOOD AIDE	7,557	8.492
ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE POLICE	10,733	15,146
CORRECTIONS	16,328	16,328
ALL CAREER PROGRAMS	12,086	14,001

MEAN ANNUAL SALARIES OF CAREER PROGRAM GRADUATES

Only general observations should be made from this table since, in some cases, the salaries represent only a few individuals and thus are not statistically significant. However, the statewide results are more meaningful since they represent more individuals.

The range of salaries for the various career programs should be observed as well as the fact that, not surprisingly, the HJC career program graduates have a lower average annual salary.

TABLE 27
TRANSFER AMONG GRADUATES WHOSE GOAL WAS TRANSFER

	1980 GRADUATES	
	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	80.0	78.3

TRANSFER AMONG GRADUATES WHOSE GOAL WAS TRANSFER

As this table displays, four out of five graduates who wished to transfer were able to achieve that goal.

TABLE 28
RESPONDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED

	1980 GRADUATES	
	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	45.2	42.0
STATUS OF STUDENTS AT TRANSFER INSTITUTION		
FULL-TIME	26.2	33.9
PART-TIME	73.8	66.1

RESPONDENTS WHO TRANSFERRED

While HJC had a higher percentage of students enrolled full-time, it is significant to note that, upon transfer, HJC has a higher percentage enrolled on a part-time basis.

TABLE 29

TRANSFER INSTITUTION OF THE 1980 GRADUATES

INSTITUTION	1980 GRADUATES HJC	STATE
MARYLAND		
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND	11.9	34.0
PUBLIC STATE COLLEGE	31.0	31.8
PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR	6.0	8.6
OTHER COMMUNITY COLLEGE	4.8	5.8
TECHNICAL/COMMERCIAL	2.4	1.1
PRIVATE TWO-YEAR	--	--
TOTAL MARYLAND	56.1	81.3
NON-MARYLAND		
PUBLIC FOUR-YEAR	32.1	9.8
PRIVATE FOUR-YEAR	9.5	5.8
OTHERS	2.4	2.0
TOTAL NON-MARYLAND	44.0	17.6

TRANSFER INSTITUTION OF THE 1980 GRADUATES

The most significant differences noted in this table are the fact that far fewer of the HJC graduates transfer to the University of Maryland when compared with the statewide results. Instead, HJC has a higher percentage of students who transfer to non-Maryland four-year public institutions, primarily Shippensburg State College and Shepherd College (see Table 12 also).

TABLE 30

RELATIONSHIP OF 1980 GRADUATES' COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS TO THEIR TRANSFER MAJOR AND EMPLOYMENT

	TRANSFER		JOB	
RELATIONSHIP	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
DIRECTLY RELATED	59.8	54.9	57.1	50.3
SOMEWHAT RELATED	26.8	35.1	27.5	30.4
NOT RELATED	13.4	10.0	15.4	19.3

RELATIONSHIP OF 1980 GRADUATES' COMMUNITY COLLEGE PROGRAMS TO THEIR TRANSFER MAJOR AND EMPLOYMENT

This table compares the relationship between the community college programs and the transfer major and the employment of the graduates. While a higher percentage of the HJC graduates are enrolled in a transfer program at a four-year institution which is not related to their community college program, there is conversely a lower percentage of HJC graduates working in a job not related to their community college program.

TABLE 31

SUCCESS OF RESPONDENTS IN TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS

	1930 GRADUATES	
CREDITS LOST	HJC	STATE
NONE	42.1	46.0
1 - 3	23.7	16.8
4 - 6	14.5	12.7
7 - 12	7.9	13.5
13 - 20	3.9	6.1
21 OR MORE	7.9	4.9
GRADE POINT AVERAGE		
BELOW 2.0	4.4	1.9
2.0 - 2.4	4.4	14.4
2.5 - 2.9	22.1	25.5
3.0 - 3.4	41.2	34.6
ABOVE 3.5	27.9	25.4
SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION		
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	36.2	35.8
SATISFIED	52.5	56.1
UNSATISFIED	11.2	8.1

SUCCESS OF RESPONDENTS IN TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS

With respect to credits lost, approximately 65% of the HJC and statewide graduates lost three or fewer credits upon transfer to a four-year institution. It also should be noted that 13.5% of the statewide respondents lost between seven and twelve credits upon transfer.

The grade point averages of the two populations are also displayed and show a very low percentage of transfers earning below a 2.0. HJC shows nearly 70% of its transfers earning a "B" average or better while the statewide results show 60% in this same category.

Only about 10% of the HJC and statewide respondents indicated they were unsatisfied with the preparation they received to transfer to a four-year institution.

TABLE 32

COMMUNITY COLLEGE EVALUATION

VARIABLE	1980 GRADUATES HJC	STATE
QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION		
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	40.4	43.6
SATISFIED	57.4	53.5
UNSATISFIED	2.2	2.8
OVERALL QUALITY OF COLLEGE		
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	49.7	45.9
SATISFIED	48.6	51.3
UNSATISFIED	1.6	2.9

COMMUNITY COLLEGE EVALUATION

With respect to the quality of instruction, 98% of the HJC graduates and 97% of the statewide graduates indicated they were extremely satisfied or satisfied with the quality of instruction at their community college.

When giving general consideration simply to the overall quality of the college, 98.4% of the HJC graduates and 97.1% of the statewide graduates say they were extremely satisfied or satisfied with the overall quality of the community college.

ENTRANTS AND GRADUATES COMPARISON

On the following pages are summarized some comparisons among 1974 and 1976 entrants and 1980 graduates from Hagerstown Junior College and from all the Maryland community colleges. These results have been presented in earlier tables but are summarized here so that comparisons can be made on key variables.

TABLE 33

EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF ENTRANTS AND GRADUATES

	ENTRANTS				GRADUATES	
	1974		1976		1980	
PRIMARY GOAL	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
PREPARE FOR TRANSFER TO A FOUR-YEAR COLLEGE	36	32	33	32	40	36
PREPARE FOR IMMEDIATE ENTRY INTO A CAREER	22	18	23	20	30	29
INTEREST AND SELF-ENRICHMENT	16	19	18	18	7	9
EXPLORE NEW CAREER OR NEW ACADEMIC AREAS	11	14	12	15	15	16
UPDATE SKILLS FOR A JOB CURRENTLY HELD	12	13	12	12	6	7
OTHER GOALS	3	3	2	3	1	3
	100	100	100	100	100	100

EDUCATIONAL GOALS OF ENTRANTS AND GRADUATES

A much higher percentage (70%-HJC; 65%-State) of the graduates indicated their primary goal was either transfer or career entry. For the entrants, the percentage ranged between 50% and 58%.

Not surprisingly, the graduates had a much lower percentage (7%-9%) of individuals with the goal of interest and self-enrichment when compared with entrants (16%-19%). Similarly, the same is true for the goal of updating skills for a job currently held. For the graduates, 6%-7% had this goal whereas 12%-13% of the entrants came to a community college with this in mind.

There is no significant difference between entrants and graduates on the goal of exploring a new career or new academic area.

TABLE 34
SELF-REPORTED GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

	ENTRANTS				GRADUATES	
	1974		1976		1980	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	69	63	69	62	86	86

SELF-REPORTED GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

Graduates obviously had a much higher percentage (86%) of respondents who reported that they achieved their goal when compared with entrants (62%-69%).

TABLE 35

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS CAREER DEVELOPMENT

	ENTRANTS				GRADUATES	
	1974		1976		1980	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	81	79	79	74	73	74

FULL-TIME EMPLOYMENT AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS CAREER DEVELOPMENT

Overall, a higher percentage (74%-81%) of 1974 and 1976 entrants were employed full-time when career development was their goal as compared with 1980 graduates (73%-74%).

TABLE 36

TRANSFER AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS TRANSFER

	ENTRANTS				GRADUATES	
	1974		1976		1980	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
TOTAL	76	76	76	70	80	78

TRANSFER AMONG STUDENTS WHOSE GOAL WAS TRANSFER

Among those students whose goal was transfer, a slightly higher percentage of graduates (78%-80)% achieved that goal when compared with entrants (70%-76%).

TABLE 37

SUCCESS OF RESPONDENTS IN TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS

	ENTRANTS				GRADUATES	
	1974		1976		1980	
	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
CREDITS LOST						
NONE	40	53	44	50	42	46
1 - 3	31	19	22	18	24	17
4 - 6	16	12	11	14	15	13
7 - 12	9	9	14	10	8	14
13 - 20	3	4	3	5	4	6
21 OR MORE	2	3	6	4	8	5
GRADE POINT AVERAGE						
BELOW 2.0	1	3	2	3	4	2
2.0 - 2.4	15	11	11	13	4	14
2.5 - 2.9	33	28	25	28	22	26
3.0 - 3.4	30	35	39	34	41	35
ABOVE 3.5	21	23	24	22	28	25
SATISFACTION WITH PREPARATION						
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	38	33	27	31	36	36
SATISFIED	50	55	59	58	53	56
UNSATISFIED	12	12	14	11	11	8

SUCCESS OF RESPONDENTS IN TRANSFER INSTITUTIONS

With respect to credits lost upon transfer, there appears to be no significant difference among entrants and graduates. Apparently, neither persistence through graduation nor departure prior to that achievement has much of an impact upon the number of credits which might be lost upon transfer.

With respect to grade point average, graduates do seem to have a somewhat higher overall grade point average after transfer. Specifically, 51%-63% of the entrants earned a grade point average of "B" or better (3.0-above) as compared with 60%-69% of the graduates who earned a "B" or better. More specifically, 21%-24% of the entrants earned a 3.5 or above whereas 25%-28% of the graduates earned this high grade point average.

A slightly higher percentage (89%-92%) of the graduates were either extremely satisfied or satisfied with their preparation for transfer when compared with entrants (86%-89%).

TABLE 38

COMMUNITY COLLEGE EVALUATION

	ENTRANTS 1976		GRADUATES 1980	
VARIABLE	HJC	STATE	HJC	STATE
QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION				
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	28	32	41	44
SATISFIED	67	62	57	54
UNSATISFIED	5	6	2	3
OVERALL QUALITY OF COLLEGE				
EXTREMELY SATISFIED	34	33	50	46
SATISFIED	64	63	49	51
UNSATISFIED	2	4	1	3

COMMUNITY COLLEGE EVALUATION

A higher percentage (97%-98%) of graduates were either extremely satisfied or satisfied with the quality of instruction as opposed to the slightly lower percentage (94%-95%) of entrants who were similarly satisfied.

The same pattern holds true for the overall quality of the college as 97%-99% of the graduates and 96%-98% of the entrants were either extremely satisfied or satisfied.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

VALUE OF THE STUDIES

Since the primary purpose of these studies was to help each of the Maryland community colleges and the State Board for Community Colleges evaluate their efforts, these studies obviously help achieve that goal. In addition to providing data required for outside agencies, they also serve the worthwhile purpose of helping each school appraise its recent success and monitor trends in credit instruction.

Furthermore, these studies help fulfill the need for educators, policy-makers, and the general public to see community colleges for what they actually do, and not simply as half of a four-year college. Efforts to continue to display community colleges correctly must continue -- we must educate decision-makers so they form an accurate perception of our role.

LOSS OF TRANSFER CREDITS

Despite the obvious success of all community college entrants and graduates, the number of credits being lost upon transfer still seems alarmingly high. And this is even more true as we are entering the 1980s and community college programs have presumably gained wide acceptance and academic credibility. Why then are so many credits being lost by community college students? Are they changing majors? Are their grades low? A statewide study or perhaps simply an addendum to the next follow-up study could attempt to find out why so many credits are being lost upon transfer.

UNDECLARED MAJORS

17%-18% of statewide respondents and 26%-29% of the HJC respondents to the entrant studies do not have a declared major. What are the implications of this? Is it "good" or "bad"? Is it true that this many students have undeclared majors or is there a flaw in the record-keeping systems? Would it be wise to "force" all students -- whether full- or part-time -- to declare a major?

DEGREE GOAL ACHIEVEMENT

While goal achievement generally was high for both HJC and statewide respondents (entrants and graduates), there has been an 8% drop from 1974 to 1976 in degree achievement among students whose original goal was a community college degree. (See Table 4.) Is this the beginning of a trend? How can we ascertain this and, if so, what can be done about it? Or is it simply a one-time occurrence and of little consequence? At the least, this question needs to be monitored carefully during the next entrants follow-up study.

GENERAL OBSERVATIONS

These studies have been refined in Maryland during the 1970s and are beginning to provide worthwhile longitudinal data. They should be continued. Nevertheless, those involved in performing studies like these need to continually ask themselves what impact (if any) this study will have, what its purposes are, and whether these purposes are being fulfilled. Can these studies be improved to provide a greater impact?

REFERENCES

Hurley, Rodney G. Maryland Community Colleges Student Follow-Up Study: First-Time Students Fall 1971. Annapolis, MD: State Board for Community Colleges, 1975.

Hurley, Rodney G. Maryland Community Colleges Student Follow-Up Study: First-Time Students Fall 1970. Annapolis, MD: State Board for Community Colleges, 1974.

McConochie, Daniel D. Four Years Later: Follow-Up of 1976 Entrants Maryland Community Colleges. Annapolis, MD: State Board for Community Colleges, 1981.

Tschechtelin, James D. Black and White Students in Maryland Community Colleges. Annapolis, MD: State Board for Community Colleges, 1979.

Tschechtelin, James D. Maryland Community Colleges Student Follow-Up Study: First-Time Students, Fall 1972. Annapolis, MD: State Board for Community Colleges, 1976.

Tschechtelin, James D. and MacClean, Abby D. Maryland Community College Student Follow-Up of Entrants and Graduates. Annapolis, MD: State Board for Community Colleges, 1980.

APPENDIX A

Maryland Community College Research Group

Roger Andersen, Allegany Community College

Richard Behrendt, Hagerstown Junior College

William Campbell, Montgomery Community College

Bill Dusman, Anne Arundel Community College

Sandra Fabella, Cecil Community College

Marc Goldstein, Charles County Community College

Jan Janssen, Garrett Community College

Matthew Kelly, Frederick Community College

Paul Larkin, Prince George's Community College

Bob Lynch, Catonsville Community College

Toby Milton, Essex Community College

Martin Nadelman, Wor-Wic Tech Community College

Larry Nespoli, Howard Community College

Bob Pedersen, Community College of Baltimore

John Quinley, Harford Community College

K. Rajasekhara, Dundalk Community College

William Seth, Chesapeake College

APPENDIX B

MARYLAND PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES
STUDENT FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE
FIRST-TIME STUDENTS, FALL 1974

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help your community college and the State Board for Community Colleges assess and improve their programs. Please complete it promptly (even if you took only one or two courses) and return in the envelope provided. All answers will be strictly confidential. Thank you for your assistance.

A. Please check what you hoped to achieve at this community college.

37
- ☐ 1. Take courses without working toward a degree or certificate
- ☐ 2. Certificate
- ☐ 3. Associate degree

B. Please check the *one* statement which most closely corresponds to your primary reason for attending this college.

38
- ☐ 1. Exploration of new career or academic areas
- ☐ 2. Preparation for immediate entry into a career
- ☐ 3. Preparation for transfer to a four-year institution
- ☐ 4. Update skills for a job currently held
- ☐ 5. Interest and self-enrichment
- ☐ 6. Other (specify) _____

C. Was your goal (indicated in Item B) achieved by the time you left this community college?

39
- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Still attending this community college

D. Did you attend this community college primarily on a part-time or full-time basis?

40
- ☐ 1. Part-time (11 credits or less per term)
- ☐ 2. Full-time (12 credits or more per term)

E. Would you recommend your program of study at this community college to a friend? (Check one)

31
- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Uncertain

F. Would you recommend this college to a friend? (Check one)

42
- ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Uncertain

G. Please respond to this item if you are no longer a student at this college.
Listed below are some academic, employment, financial, and personal reasons why a student might leave college. To what extent were these your reasons for leaving this college? (Check as many as apply.)

- 43 ☐ a. Achieved educational goal
- 44 ☐ b. Changed educational goal
- 45 ☐ c. Scheduling conflict between job and studies
- 46 ☐ d. Accepted a job
- 47 ☐ e. Went into military service
- 48 ☐ f. Program or courses not available at this college
- 49 ☐ g. Dissatisfaction with program
- 50 ☐ h. Unsure about my choice of major
- 51 ☐ i. Course work not challenging
- 52 ☐ j. Low grades
- 53 ☐ k. Found courses too difficult
- 54 ☐ l. Dissatisfied with quality of teaching
- 55 ☐ m. Transferred
- 56 ☐ n. Applied, but could not obtain financial aid
- 57 ☐ o. Financial aid was not sufficient
- 58 ☐ p. Child care too costly
- 59 ☐ q. This college was too expensive
- 60 ☐ r. Personal/marriage

H. If you are no longer a student at this college, look at the above list and select the three most important reasons why you did not return to this college. (List, in order of importance, the appropriate letter [a, b, c, etc.] in the boxes below.)

- 61 First ☐
- 62 Second ☐
- 63 Third ☐

OVER

EMPLOYMENT

Check one answer for each question.

I. Your current employment status.

- ☐ 1. Employed part-time
- 64 ☐ 2. Employed full-time
- ☐ 3. Unemployed and seeking a job
- ☐ 4. Unemployed and not seeking a job

If you are currently unemployed, skip to item N.

J. Did you hold this same job while attending the community college?

- 65 ☐ 1. Yes
- ☐ 2. No

K. Geographic location in which you are presently employed.

- ☐ 1. Same county/city as this community college
- ☐ 2. Other county in Maryland
- ☐ 3. Baltimore City
- ☐ 4. Washington, D.C.
- 66 ☐ 5. Delaware
- ☐ 6. Pennsylvania
- ☐ 7. Virginia
- ☐ 8. West Virginia
- ☐ 9. Other state

L. Relationship between your program at this community college and your job.

- ☐ 1. Program directly related to job
- 67 ☐ 2. Program somewhat related to job
- ☐ 3. Program not at all related to job

M. Did your educational program at this community college assist you in:
Increasing your theoretical understanding required for your job?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 68 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

Increasing your abilities to perform skills required by your job?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 69 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

Obtaining your job?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 70 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

Obtaining salary increases and/or promotions?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 71 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

TRANSFER

If you enrolled at *another* college since leaving this college, please respond to the following questions, even if you are no longer a student.
Check one answer for each question.

N. Indicate the type of institution to which you transferred.

- ☐ 1. Another Maryland public community college
- ☐ 2. A public State college in Maryland
- ☐ 3. The University of Maryland
- ☐ 4. Maryland private four-year college or university
- 72 ☐ 5. A private two-year Maryland college
- ☐ 6. Maryland technical or commercial school
- ☐ 7. Out-of-state four-year public college or university
- ☐ 8. Out-of-state four-year private college or university
- ☐ 9. Other out-of-state college or university

O. What was your enrollment status when you enrolled in the institution indicated above.

- ☐ 1. Part-time
- 73 ☐ 2. Full-time

P. Indicate your overall grade point average at the transfer institution (based on a 4-point scale).

- ☐ 1. Less than 2.0
- ☐ 2. 2.0 - 2.4
- 74 ☐ 3. 2.5 - 2.9
- ☐ 4. 3.0 - 3.4
- ☐ 5. 3.5 and over

Q. To what extent was your curriculum program at this community college related to your major at the transfer institution?

- ☐ 1. Directly related
- 75 ☐ 2. Somewhat related
- ☐ 3. Not related

R. How satisfied were you with your preparation for transfer?

- ☐ 1. Extremely satisfied
- 76 ☐ 2. Satisfied
- ☐ 3. Unsatisfied

S. How many credit hours earned at this community college were not accepted at the transfer institution?

- ☐ 1. All credit hours accepted
- ☐ 2. Lost 1-3 credit hours
- 77 ☐ 3. Lost 4-6 credit hours
- ☐ 4. Lost 7-12 credit hours
- ☐ 5. Lost 13-20 credit hours
- ☐ 6. Lost more than 21 credit hours

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX C

MARYLAND COMMUNITY COLLEGES
STUDENT FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE
FIRST-TIME STUDENTS, FALL 1976

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help your community college and the State Board for Community Colleges assess and improve their programs. Please complete it promptly (even if you took only one or two courses) and return in the envelope provided. All answers will be strictly confidential. Thank you for your assistance.

A. Please check what you hoped to achieve at this community college.

37 ☐ 1. Take courses without working toward a degree or certificate
☐ 2. Certificate
☐ 3. Associate degree

B. Please check the one statement which most closely corresponds to your primary reason for attending this college.

☐ 1. Exploration of new career or academic areas
☐ 2. Preparation for immediate entry into a career
38 ☐ 3. Preparation for transfer to a four-year institution
☐ 4. Update skills for a job currently held
☐ 5. Interest and self-enrichment
☐ 6. Other (specify) _____

C. Was your goal (indicated in Item B) achieved by the time you left this community college?

☐ 1. Yes
39 ☐ 2. No
☐ 3. Still attending this community college

D. Did you attend this community college primarily on a part-time or full-time basis?

40 ☐ 1. Part-time (11 credits or less per term)
☐ 2. Full-time (12 credits or more per term)

E. How satisfied were you with the quality of classroom instruction in your program of study? (check one)

☐ 1. Extremely satisfied
41 ☐ 2. Satisfied
☐ 3. Unsatisfied

F. How satisfied were you with the overall quality of this community college? (check one)

☐ 1. Extremely satisfied
42 ☐ 2. Satisfied
☐ 3. Unsatisfied

G. Please respond to this item if you are no longer a student at this college.
Listed below are some academic, employment, financial, and personal reasons why a student might leave college. To what extent were these your reasons for leaving this college? (Check as many as apply.)

43 ☐ a. Achieved educational goal
44 ☐ b. Changed educational goal
45 ☐ c. Scheduling conflict between job and studies
46 ☐ d. Accepted a job
47 ☐ e. Went into military service
48 ☐ f. Program or courses not available at this college
49 ☐ g. Dissatisfaction with program
50 ☐ h. Unsure about my choice of major
51 ☐ i. Course work not challenging
52 ☐ j. Low grades
53 ☐ k. Found courses too difficult
54 ☐ l. Dissatisfied with quality of teaching
55 ☐ m. Transferred
56 ☐ n. Applied, but could not obtain financial aid
57 ☐ o. Financial aid was not sufficient
58 ☐ p. Child care too costly
59 ☐ q. This college was too expensive
60 ☐ r. Personal/marriage

H. If you are no longer a student at this college, look at the above list and select the three most important reasons why you did not return to this college. (List, in order of importance, the appropriate letter [a, b, c, etc.] in the boxes below.)

61 First ☐
62 Second ☐
63 Third ☐

OVER

EMPLOYMENT

Check one answer for each question.

I. Your current employment status.

- ☐ 1. Employed part-time
- 64 ☐ 2. Employed full-time
- ☐ 3. Unemployed and seeking a job
- ☐ 4. Unemployed and not seeking a job

If you are currently unemployed, skip to item N.

J. Did you hold this same job while attending the community college?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 65 ☐ 2. No

K. Geographic location in which you are presently employed.

- ☐ 1. Same county/city as this community college
- ☐ 2. Other county in Maryland
- ☐ 3. Baltimore City
- ☐ 4. Washington, D.C.
- 66 ☐ 5. Delaware
- ☐ 6. Pennsylvania
- ☐ 7. Virginia
- ☐ 8. West Virginia
- ☐ 9. Other state

L. Relationship between your program at this community college and your job.

- ☐ 1. Program directly related to job
- 67 ☐ 2. Program somewhat related to job
- ☐ 3. Program not at all related to job

M. Did your educational program at this community college assist you in:
Increasing your theoretical understanding required for your job?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 68 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

Increasing your abilities to perform skills required by your job?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 69 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

Obtaining your job?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 70 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

Obtaining salary increases and/or promotions?

- ☐ 1. Yes
- 71 ☐ 2. No
- ☐ 3. Not applicable

TRANSFER

If you enrolled at *another* college since leaving this college, please respond to the following questions, even if you are no longer a student.
Check one answer for each question.

N. Indicate the type of institution to which you transferred.

- ☐ 1. Another Maryland public community college
- ☐ 2. A public State college in Maryland
- ☐ 3. The University of Maryland
- ☐ 4. Maryland private four-year college or university
- 72 ☐ 5. A private two-year Maryland college
- ☐ 6. Maryland technical or commercial school
- ☐ 7. Out-of-state four-year public college or university
- ☐ 8. Out-of-state four-year private college or university
- ☐ 9. Other out-of-state college or university

O. What was your enrollment status when you enrolled in the institution indicated above.

- ☐ 1. Part-time
- 73 ☐ 2. Full-time

P. Indicate your overall grade point average at the transfer institution (based on a 4-point scale).

- ☐ 1. Less than 2.0
- ☐ 2. 2.0 - 2.4
- 74 ☐ 3. 2.5 - 2.9
- ☐ 4. 3.0 - 3.4
- ☐ 5. 3.5 and over

Q. To what extent was your curriculum program at this community college related to your major at the transfer institution?

- ☐ 1. Directly related
- 75 ☐ 2. Somewhat related
- ☐ 3. Not related

R. How satisfied were you with your preparation for transfer?

- ☐ 1. Extremely satisfied
- 76 ☐ 2. Satisfied
- ☐ 3. Unsatisfied

S. How many credit hours earned at this community college were not accepted at the transfer institution?

- ☐ 1. All credit hours accepted
- ☐ 2. Lost 1-3 credit hours
- 77 ☐ 3. Lost 4-6 credit hours
- ☐ 4. Lost 7-12 credit hours
- ☐ 5. Lost 13-20 credit hours
- ☐ 6. Lost more than 21 credit hours

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE

APPENDIX D

MARYLAND PUBLIC COMMUNITY COLLEGES GRADUATE FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

The purpose of this questionnaire is to help your community college and the State Board for Community Colleges assess and improve their programs. Please complete it promptly and return it in the envelope provided. This form should require less than 10 minutes to complete. All answers will be strictly confidential. Thank you for your assistance.

(Please make corrections if necessary.)

_____
(Name)

_____
(Address)

_____

ALL GRADUATES SHOULD COMPLETE PART I.

PART I.

A. Check the items that describe your current status. (check as many as apply)

37 [ ] In school
38 [ ] Employed
39 [ ] Not employed
40 [ ] Full-time home responsibility
41 [ ] In active military services
42 [ ] Other (specify) _____

B. Check the one statement which most closely corresponds to your primary reason for attending this community college. (check one)

[ ] 1. Exploration of new career or academic areas
[ ] 2. Preparation for immediate entry into a career
[ ] 3. Preparation for transfer to a four-year institution
43 [ ] 4. Update skills for a job currently held
[ ] 5. Interest and self-enrichment
[ ] 6. Other (specify) _____

C. Was your goal (indicated in Item B) achieved by the time you graduated from this community college? (check one)

44 [ ] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No

D. How satisfied were you with the quality of classroom instruction in your program of study? (check one)

[ ] 1. Extremely satisfied
45 [ ] 2. Satisfied
[ ] 3. Unsatisfied

E. How satisfied were you with the overall quality of this community college? (check one)

[ ] 1. Extremely satisfied
46 [ ] 2. Satisfied
[ ] 3. Unsatisfied

F. What was the **most important** reason you chose this communtiy college? (check one)

47
- [ ] 1. Low cost
- [ ] 2. Convenient location
- [ ] 3. Program I wanted was offered
- [ ] 4. Financial aid was available
- [ ] 5. Unwilling or unable to attend another college
- [ ] 6. College's good academic reputation
- [ ] 7. Advice of friends
- [ ] 8. Advice of high school counselor

IF YOU ARE IN SCHOOL, COMPLETE PART 2; OTHERWISE, GO TO PART 3.

PART 2.

G. What type of school are you currently attending? (check one)

48
- [ ] 1. Another Maryland public community college
- [ ] 2. A public State college in Maryland
- [ ] 3. The University of Maryland
- [ ] 4. Maryland private four-year college or university
- [ ] 5. A private two-year Maryland college
- [ ] 6. Maryland technical or commercial school
- [ ] 7. Out-of-state four-year public college or university
- [ ] 8. Out-of-state four-year private college or university
- [ ] 9. Other out-of-state college or university

Enter name of school here:

_____

_____

H. What is your enrollment status in the school indicated above?

49
- [ ] 1. Part-time
- [ ] 2. Full-time

I. Indicate your overall grade point average for credits earned at the transfer school (based on a 4-point scale).

50
- [ ] 1. Less than 2.0
- [ ] 2. 2.0-2.4
- [ ] 3. 2.5-2.9
- [ ] 4. 3.0-3.4
- [ ] 5. 3.5 and over
- [ ] 6. Have not yet completed a full semester

J. To what extent was your curriculum program at this community college related to your major at the transfer school?

51
- [ ] 1. Directly related
- [ ] 2. Somewhat related
- [ ] 3. Not related

K. How satisfied were you with your preparation for transfer?

52
- [ ] 1. Extremely satisfied
- [ ] 2. Satisfied
- [ ] 3. Unsatisfied

L. How many credit hours earned at this community college were not accepted at the transfer school?

53
- [ ] 1. All credit hours accepted
- [ ] 2. Lost 1-3 credit hours
- [ ] 3. Lost 4-6 credit hours
- [ ] 4. Lost 7-12 credit hours
- [ ] 5. Lost 13-20 credit hours
- [ ] 6. Lost more than 21 credit hours

72

IF YOU ARE EMPLOYED, COMPLETE PART 3; OTHERWISE, GO TO PART 4.

PART 3.

M. Your current employment status.

54 [ ] 1. Employed part-time
[ ] 2. Employed full-time

N. What is the title of your current position?

_____

Employer's name and address:

55-57 S O C

_____

_____

_____

O. Will you give the college permission to contact your employer for the purpose of evaluating your community college program?

[ ] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No

58 Supervisor's name: _____

Supervisor's title: _____

P. When did you begin your present job? (check one)

[ ] 1. Before attending this community college
59 [ ] 2. While attending this community college
[ ] 3. After graduating from this community college

Q. Geographic location in which you are presently employed. (check one)

[ ] 1. Same county/city as this community college
[ ] 2. Other county in Maryland
[ ] 3. Baltimore City
[ ] 4. Washington, D.C.
60 [ ] 5. Delaware
[ ] 6. Pennsylvania
[ ] 7. Virginia
[ ] 8. West Virginia
[ ] 9. Other state

R. Relationship between your program at this community college and your job. (check one)

[ ] 1. Program directly related to job
61 [ ] 2. Program somewhat related to job
[ ] 3. Program not at all related to job

S. If your job is **not** related to your program of study, check the major reason below. (check one)

[ ] 1. Could not find job in field of preparation
[ ] 2. Better pay in field in which employed
[ ] 3. Better opportunity for advancement in field in which employed
62 [ ] 4. Did not want to work in the field of preparation
[ ] 5. Program of study at this college was not career-oriented
[ ] 6. Other (please explain) _____

T. On the average, how many hours per week do you work?

63-64 _____ hours

U. If you are employed *full-time*, what is your current salary (without overtime and before deductions)?

65-68 $_____ per (check one)

69 [ ] 1. Hour
[ ] 2. Week
[ ] 3. Month

V. Who helped you locate your current job? (check as many as appropriate)

70 [ ] Faculty member
71 [ ] College Placement Office
72 [ ] Newspaper
73 [ ] Employment agency
74 [ ] Contacted employer on my own
75 [ ] Family or friend
76 [ ] Other

W. How satisfied are you with your community college preparation for employment? (check one)

[ ] 1. Extremely satisfied
77 [ ] 2. Satisfied
[ ] 3. Unsatisfied

IF YOU ARE NOT EMPLOYED, COMPLETE PART 4.

PART 4.

X. Please check one.

78 [ ] 1. I am seeking a job
[ ] 2. I am not seeking a job

Y. If you are seeking a job, please check the **major** reason you have been unable to secure employment. (check one)

[ ] 1. Salary too low in the field for which I was prepared at the community college
[ ] 2. There are few openings in the field for which I was prepared
79 [ ] 3. I need more education to qualify for the job I want
[ ] 4. I have changed my career objective since graduating
[ ] 5. I have not looked hard enough

What changes could be made to your community college program to improve a graduate's employment and/or transfer performance?

_____

_____

_____

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please return it in the enclosed prepaid envelope.

Student Goal Achievement in Maryland Community Colleges

Why do Maryland residents attend community colleges and how successful are they in accomplishing their personal and academic goals? Partial answers to these two questions are available from follow-up surveys of former students conducted by the seventeen Maryland community colleges and the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges.

In general, community college students, both graduates and nongraduates, have a high rate of achievement of employment, enrichment, and preparation for transfer goals; and the ratio of achievement in these goals increased in Maryland community colleges in the 1970s. A smaller proportion of students had achieved their initial goal of an AA degree. Students who did not graduate reported a number of reasons for leaving. Dissatisfaction with the college or program was mentioned by very few of those who had not graduated.

The Surveys

Maryland community colleges and the Maryland State Board for Community Colleges have cooperated since 1974 in conducting follow-up surveys of both graduates and nongraduating students. Using a standard questionnaire developed by the Maryland Community College Research Group, the colleges have conducted surveys of all students who first entered the colleges in 1971, 1972, 1974, and 1976. The four surveys, each of which was conducted three and one-half years after the students entered the college, provided data on student characteristics and experiences, both while they were at the college and since they left the college.

Response rates to the mailed surveys were 42 percent in the 1975 survey of all students who entered in 1971, 48 percent in the study of 1972 entrants, 43 percent for the 1974 entrants, and 47 percent for the 1976 entrants. Altogether, over 30,000 students have responded to the four surveys.

Student Goal Achievement

Each of the four surveys of entering students contained questions concerning the primary reasons for attending the college and what the student hoped to accomplish. The Student Goal Achievement Index summarizes student achievement in the four goal areas most often chosen by the students. The goal areas are: employment, transfer to a four-year college, personal interest/self-enrichment, and degree attainment. The SGAI adds the number of these goals which were achieved by students at a college and divides this sum by the number of students who reported that they had initially had one of these goals. Only persons whose goals were unchanged and who have left the community college are included in the construction of the Index.

In the construction of the SGAI for a college each student contributes to the college's score. Colleges where the number of students choosing a particular goal is small are not penalized in the computations. However, because a student can choose an AA degree goal and one of the three other areas, the degree goal area has more influence on the final SGAI score than the other three goal areas.

Because the Index scores are not based on institutional rankings, each college has an Index value that is independent and can be increased without reducing another college's score. Values for the Index were computed for each college for the 1971, 1972, 1974, and 1976 entrants.

The average Index score for the 1976 entrants was 58. The scores of the individual colleges ranged from 48 to 78 with six colleges scoring lower than the average score. Eleven colleges had scores of 58 or higher.

A closer examination of achievement trends in the four goal areas used in the construction of the SGAI revealed that scores in the employment, transfer, and enrichment goal areas had all increased from the corresponding scores of the 1971 entrants. Achievement in the degree goal area fell seven points.

The scores of the 1976 entrants in the transfer, employment, and enrichment goal areas have in general been increasing since the survey of the 1971 entrants. Among the 1976 entrants 1,673 students or 77 percent of those who reported that they had entered the college to prepare for a career were employed full-time. The achievement rates for this goal area ranged from 71 to 84 at the colleges. Three colleges increased their scores in the goal area from the 1974 entrants to the 1976 entrants.

In the goal area of transfer, the Statewide Index score increased from 65 for the 1971 entrants to 76 for the 1974 entrants. There were six colleges where 80 percent or more of those students whose goal was to prepare to transfer achieved this goal. Nine colleges had improved their scores in this goal area from the 1974 entrants to the 1976 entrants.

Sixty percent of the 1,076 entrants in 1976 whose goal had been to take courses for self-interest and enrichment reported that they had achieved this goal. The State average increased from 54 to 60 from the 1971 entrants to the 1976 entrants. Seven colleges increased their scores from the 1974 entrants to the 1976 entrants in this goal area.

In the survey of 1976 entrants 36 percent of those whose goal was an AA degree had accomplished that goal. The achievement rate in this goal area has declined by seven points from the 1971 entrants and by eight points from the 1974 entrants. The follow-up surveys offer a partial explanation for this decline.

The decline in degree goal achievement has not been associated with discontent or dissatisfaction with the colleges. Community college students continue to report high rates of satisfaction with instruction (94 percent) and with the overall quality of the college (96 percent). Among the 1976 entrants, 20 percent of the nongraduates reported that they had left the college because they had achieved their educational goal. Fifteen percent had transferred prior to graduation; 14 percent reported scheduling conflicts; 10 percent had left because of a personal/marriage reason; and 11 percent of those who had left before achieving their AA degree goal had accepted employment. Other, apparently minor reasons, ranged from program not available (5 percent), unsure of major (5 percent), changed goal (5 percent) to courses too difficult (one percent).

Summary and Implications

Student success in achieving their goals in general has remained high. The SGAI, a quantitative indicator of each college's success in helping its students achieve these goals, has increased from the survey of 1971 entrants to the 1976 entrants.

A decline in degree goal achievement has not been associated with discontent or dissatisfaction with the colleges. On the contrary, in the follow-up surveys community college students continue to report high rates of satisfaction with instruction and the overall quality of their college. Other data in the survey point out that an increasing number and proportion of students are transferring before they graduate and a large proportion of these nongraduates report that they have either achieved their educational goal or changed their goal. Whether these students gave up an important goal between their entry in 1976 or whether other alternatives became more important is not entirely clear using the data available in the follow-up surveys.

The meaning and implication of the decline in degree goal achievement will require a qualitative examination of what the change portends for the community college. The SGAI analyses make clear that the decrease in degree goal achievement is not unique to one college but one which is shared by almost every community college in Maryland.

GOAL ACHIEVEMENT—1976 ENTRANTS
Maryland Community Colleges

College	Goals: Enrichment N	Enrichment %	Transfer N	Transfer %	Employment N	Employment %	Degree N	Degree %	Student Goal Achievement Index
Allegany	14	54	33	75	90	78	100	62	68
Anne Arundel	69	53	220	78	197	84	127	31	58
Baltimore	55	55	45	57	141	73	50	22	48
Catonsville	69	62	116	80	150	78	90	34	60
Cecil	14	54	13	59	12	75	8	35	54
Charles	34	61	40	87	59	72	35	38	61
Chesapeake	4	100	15	88	15	71	27	69	75
Dundalk	30	58	15	75	36	84	6	10	50
Essex	68	53	148	66	200	71	182	41	55
Frederick	24	77	86	84	62	82	41	41	69
Garrett	8	80	9	100	11	73	10	67	78
Hagerstown	41	72	92	80	96	79	88	48	67
Harford	33	73	72	77	91	84	29	18	55
Howard	21	78	26	62	47	80	39	54*	66
Montgomery	128	60	404	70	314	73	233	29	53
Prince George's	27	52	156	75	138	79	167	45*	61
Wor-Wic Tech	4	57	–	–	14	82	9	43	60
Statewide	643	60	1,490	74	1,673	77	1,241	36	58

*Degree data estimated, based on rate of achievement to degree goal at that college in survey of 1974 entrants

The above information is a brief extract on the subject. Additional information and the complete report are available on request from the SBCC Office.